

ERASTANK'

ERIC P. HAMP
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

R. S. P. Beekes, *Die Laryngaltheorie* (1988) 77 §3.1a, traces *erastank'* to **perOkt-*. However, if that were the case I should expect an Armenian *h-*; cf. my analysis *Journal of Turkish Studies* 9, 1985, 133-5, I therefore maintain the reconstruction I offered in *AArmL.* 4, 1983, 64-5; cf. *KZ* 95, 1981, 81f. Or else it was **pr(e)Okt-*.

INTERNAL IE SCHWA

Beekes, *op. cit.*, mentions *dustr*, but apart from his remarks (63) on possible alternants in the IE pre-form, one should bear in mind the possibly special sequence in this word which I have discussed in *JAOS* 90, 1970, 228-31. NB now Gaulish *duxtir*.

Under Beekes's formulation *CaCC* we must put *atawri*, since the unambiguous reconstruction **AelE-tr-* is preferable in its

vocalism to his **AlE-tr-* for this morphology. Such a derived stem goes, of course, along with *arawr*.

For a reasonably clear instance of **-CaC-* see my analysis of *ner*, *RĖA* (n.s.) 3, 1966: 11-15. Of course, single intervocalic consonants are likely to vanish, and so our opportunities to observe **-CaC-* sequences may be expected to be limited. In this sense, an interstage **nyayr* is a lucky window on the process.

The form *cnawt* 'parent' <**ġenEtlo-* is interesting in multiple ways. The output of **-tl-* is itself worth noting, since we have had occasion (*AArmLing*, 11, 1990,23) to observe the fate of a laryngeal as *w* in *canawt*. We have in **cinawt* a parallel formation to *arawr*. On the other hand, because of the loss of gender in Armenian we have a merger of the agent/animate (OCS *bljustelъ*) and instrument/inanimate (Lith. *giřslas* 'ear', Lat. *pōculum*) formations; then, too, Greek displays the thematic *ἰατρός* 'physician', while Slavic has the thematic "animate" *větrъ* 'wind'. Through all of this, when we recall dialect Greek *ἰατήρ* beside *ἰατρός*, the occurrence of *cnawt* suggests strongly the former presence in Armenian of **ġenE-tel-* [+anim.].

There is no clear reason why *getmm* 'wool', in its new productive derivative in **-mn*, could not have been aniṭ at this phase in its history.

I see no reason to reconstruct *gar̄n* as **urEen-* if we take proper note of Greek *ῥαρν-*.

I therefore do not see the motivation for Beekes's formulation of schwa without vocalisation in Armenian.

ON THE EXTENT AND LIMITS OF CURRENT LARYNGEAL KNOWLEDGE

ERIC P. HAMP
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

With his characteristic erudition and analytic energy Frederik Otto Lindeman has contributed (*AArmL* 11, 1990, 25-30) to the question of the reflexes in Armenian of the Indo-European laryngeals.¹ His discussion, however, contains an error of reconstructive reasoning.

It is true that (§2) the exact inventory (and distribution) of Anatolian descendant sounds remains uncertain. Yet our grasp of the range of antecedent IE (or IH) structure points for observed Anatolian reflexes is less uncertain. So, we find Hitt, *eszi*, *edmi*; *asanzi*, *adanzi*; perhaps *mehur*, *sehur* showing hiatus? (*E); *hant-*,

1. I leave out of account here my own view that Albanian imposes on us the need to reconstruct a fourth laryngeal.

harki-, *huhhas*; *neuahh-*, *pahhur* (*A = H²);² *hastai*, *haran-*, *hark-* 'perish'; medially uncertain in *pahs-* 'guard', *pass-* 'swallow', *lahw-* 'pour'(*O); *arki-* 'penis' = Alb. *herdhe* 'testicles', *upzi* 'rises' = Alb. *hyp* (*A = H⁴). I see no reason why *ewa-* 'barley' or *iugan* 'yoke' called for initial laryngeals. In my theory *appan* 'behind, after' may reflect *H⁴. If *henk-* 'offer' really was *Oe-Eenk-, or *Oe-Eink- it might be that *hēu-* 'rain' was *OEeEu- with an initial like that of *OEekuo- 'horse' (cf. E.P. Hamp in *When Worlds Collide* [ed. Thomas Markey and John A. C. Greppin, Ann Arbor, Karoma 1990: 211-226]). In short, the Hittite evidence, while suffering from gaps and some ambiguities, is sufficiently distinctive and unambiguous to support a theory of three or four laryngeals and to permit a debate between these two views on the basis of the full IE evidence. It is in this sense that I differ with Lindeman's depiction in §2.

I see the evidence differently from that alluded to in §3 for *CHC*. The word for 'daughter' must be set aside from other forms which we know well; the Nuristani and Gaulish (*duxtir*) forms show us that we have here a sequence of different constituency. Most other cases of apparent lack of expected laryngeal reflex can be credited to laryngeal dropping in compounding by IE rule; apparent conservation of laryngeals in such compounds can be understood as restoration from the simplex. It is interesting that the archaic reduplicated forms such as Vedic *dadh-māsi*, *dād-mahe* and Greek γίγνομαι seem to show by their absence of a laryngeal reflex the effect of the original word-juncture after the reduplication. Thus the conditions for Gathic Av. *ptā* would be different from those for *dugdar*. It may be, on the other hand, that a non-syllabification of the laryngeal in compounds led to the

2. I do not include *hasterza* 'star' since I find this ambiguous; cf. my proposal *AArmL*. 3, 1982, 53f.

development of *hi-ta-* beside *dhā-* parallel to *duhitār-*.

In light of these complex questions Lindeman would do better to illustrate the well known IE ablaut relation not with *hi-ta-* : *dhā-* but, say, with *śi-tā-*, *śi-śī-māsi*, *śi-śī-te*, *śi-śī-hī* : *śi-śā-ti*, *śi-śā-tu*, from the root *śā* 'sharpen', all of these except the first containing the reduplication *śi- < *ki-*. The Latin equation to this paired relation is seen in *catus* 'clever, shrill' : *cōs*, *cōtis* 'whetstone' (: Persian *sān* 'whetstone', negligently lacking macron in IEW 542), and probably in Greek it is *κότος* 'spite' (not, I claim, to Germanic-Celtic *katu-* 'battle' nor to Skt. *śātru-* 'enemy') < **kO-to-*; *κῶνος* 'helmet spike'. OIr. *cath* 'wise' might be a borrowing from Latin. The Albanian equation, I propose, is *thadrë* 'a kind of two-bladed ax or adze' < **kO-d(h)-i-tro-*³ (or *-dhro-*): *ther* 'slaughter(s), cut(s)' = (in stem) Armenian *sur* 'sharp' < **keO-ró-*, *sur sroy* 'sword' < **keO-ro-* (or *-oO-?* or **keOres-* [neut.], pace B. A. Olsen, *AArmL* 10, 1989: 12 §4.6. The internal Latin paradigm is to be seen in *serō* (**si-sE-oH*), *satum* (**sE-tó-*) : *sēuī* (**seE-*), *sēmen* (**seE-mn*)⁴, or, less perfectly preserved, in *statum* (**stA-tó-*) : *stāmen* (**steA-mn*)⁵. Welsh mirrors the Latin paradigm with *heaf* 'I sow' (**si-sE-mī*), *had* 'seed' (**sE-tó-*) ; *hil*, 'progeny' (**seE-lo-*)⁶ = OIr. *sīl* 'seed', OE *sæd* (**seE-tó-*). The same relation is found in Lat. *datum* (**dO-tó-*) : *dōnum* (**deO-no-*), Lith. *dāvė* pret. (**dO-u-eE-*) : *dúoti* (**deO-tei*), Arm. *tam* (**dO-*) :

3. I differ for various reasons with N. Jokl's reconstruction, *Linguistisch-kulturhistorische Untersuchungen aus dem Bereiche des Albanischen* (Berlin/Leipzig 1923) 157-9. It is possible that the medial vowel was other than **i*.

4. = OPrussian *semen* : Lith. *sėmenys*.

5. cf. Lith. *stóti*, *stója*, *stójo*, OHG *stat* (**stA-tī-*).

6. cf. Lycian *hadi* 'releases' (**seE-t-i*), *tadi* 'puts' (**dheE-t-i*).

etu (*deO-), *tur* (*deO-ro-), and in Toch AB *tās-* 'put' (*dhE-se/o-)⁷: pret. Lith. *dèjo* (*dheE-ieA-), Arm. *edi* (*dheE-), Goth. dat. sg. *gadedai*, OE *dǣd* (*dheE-í-)⁸.

Having presented such facts and interpretations of laryngeal survival and mutation in the non-Anatolian and non-Hellenic branches of IE Lindeman then proceeds to infer a chronology of dispersal for these IE dislects. Here his reasoning falls prey to a well established fallacy.

Lindeman claims (27) that after the early separation of Anatolian, to which I would agree on a number of grounds, we "have no other alternative than to assume that Greek must have separated...even before Anatolian." This reasoning is based on the conservation of colouring in the vocalisations of laryngeals in Greek (θετός, δοτός, etc., which appears to go together with the distinctive "prothetic" vowels seen in ἐννέα, ὀφέλλω, etc., and the "long vocalic sonants" of -γνητος, γνωτός, etc.,) and its innovatory loss in other branches in these contexts. That is to say, Lindeman's argument reasons from shared innovation (which we all agree is correct as the diagnostic criterion) by loss of an inherited distinction (which is invalid as a criterion). For familial subgrouping (and therefore for determining nodes of branching) only innovations by replacement or addition of elements/features/distinctions with respect to the proto will qualify.

Reasoning from loss in this situation forms an instance or subtype of the well recognized fallacy of the *argumentum ex silentio*.

7. Phryg. aor. ἄδ-δα-κ-ετ (*dhE-).

8. And perhaps Arm. *dir* (see B. A. Olsen, *AArmL* 10, 1989: 10 § 2.3), though a stem parallel to *tur-*, with vestigial *o*-stem, still seems plausible to me.

CORRIGENDUM AND REFINEMENT

ERIC P. HAMP
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

In *AArmL* 11, 1990: 23, I failed to catch the inadvertent omission of diacritics in *čanač'em* 'know'. This well known present faces anomalously the aorist *caneay*. I particularly regret this oversight because I should not like to have the effect of adding to what I notice to be an unfortunate muddle in the reporting on this important verb. Our reference works give us far from the desired clarity.

Meillet *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch* (1913) 100-1, §111 characteristically gives us an unexceptionable and correct synchronic account, dwelling on the underlying class characteristic as an *i*-stem. In his *Esquisse* (1936), summarily 182, his account bridges all the essential synchronic and diachronic facts and issues; in particular, Meillet characterizes our verb crisply as "verbe anomal dont présent et aor. appartiennent à la même racine". His account (109 §79) of *-č-* as an "élargissement d'un présent en **-ske-* par le

suffixe **-ye-*", adducing ἐγρήσσω and Att. δεδίττομαι (: δεδίοκομαι 'fear') \cong *erknč'im*, is perfectly adequate and apposite. I have remarked (KZ 89, 1975: 104 §12) that there is no problem in finding affixal conglutinations that accumulate by degrees through accretion or growing opaqueness or new paradigmatic motivations; cf. φθίνω and φθινύθω, ὀφείλω and ὀφλισκάνω, μαραίνω, ὑφαίνω, κρῖνω (: Lat. *cernō*), Lith. *jūngia* and *jūnksta*, or the accumulations of preverbs in Old Irish and (differently) in British Celtic. Meillet's recovery in Armenian of **ḡnA^w-sk(-ie)-* : *ḡnA^w-i-* or *-eE-*, moreover, matches well in formation Greek γι-γνώσκ-ω : ἔ-γινω-ν, Lat. (*g*)*no-sc-ō* : *nō-u-ī*, O Per. *xšnā-s-ā-tiy* (subjunctive): RV *ja-jñ-us* (pf.), Toch. A *kānts*⁻¹ 'acknowledge' Albanian *njeh*² 'knows': Goth. *kunnan* OHG *kunnēn* (: *kann*), perhaps Lith. *pa-žī-stu* : *žin-óti*; for my analysis of the old nasal present underlying the Germanic and Baltic see *Ériu* 24, 1973, 161-2. On grounds of dialectology (Iranian Helleno-Armenian, Italic, Tocharian, Albanian, and plausibly Baltic) the formation **ḡnA^w-skelo-* was PIE.

In this, as in other respects, Pokorny's account *IEW* 376 is out of date and was inadequate when it appeared in 1950.

On these grounds we cannot follow the argument of Gevork Вю Djahukian (Г. Б. Джаукян, Сравнительная грамматика армянского языка [Yerevan, Press of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1982: 180-181]): Элемент *-č'*- может восходить к *-ky-* или

1. Douglas Q. Adams, *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology* (AOS, New Haven, 1988) 32 and 46, PTch **knāsk-* < **ḡnE-skelo-*, but whose **E* should read **O*, i.e. **A^w*.

2. This is really **ḡnō-sk-e/o-* = **ḡneA^w-sk-*, with the vocalism of ἔγινων, as in the Old Persian and Latin. The 1sg. *njoh* etc. are back-formed as if there was a (regular) 2, 3sg. umlaut.

*-ty- (но не к *-sky-, как предполагает А. Мейе). Имея в виду соответствие *t'* (**t*) : *č'* (**ty*) в *աղաւթեմ* "молюсь" (*աղաւթ-բ* "молитва") : *աղաչեմ* "молю, умоляю, прошу", можно в глаголе *հանաչեմ* при *ծանալիք* "знакомый" предположить первичную основу на *-*t*- с дальнейшим вторичным образованием суффиксом *-*ye*-. "The element -*č'*- can go back to *-*ky*- or *-*ty*- (but not to *-*sky*- as A. Meillet proposes). In view of the correspondence *t'* (**t*): *č'* (**ty*) in *աղաւթեմ* 'I beg' (*աղաւթ-կ'* 'prayer'): *աղաչեմ* 'I ask', in the verb *հանաչեմ* to *canawt'* 'acquainted' it is possible to attribute an original base in *-*t*- with a further secondary formation with a suffix *-*ye*." But this analysis introduces an otherwise unconfirmed *-*t*- in certain (many?) bases, and in the well attested base **ġenA^w*- ~ *ġneA^w*-; it also leaves the absence of *w* unexplained. Djahukian is further obliged (181-2) to seek an origin for other bases in a vague *-*k*- (mixing in the aorist marker which was correlated with laryngeal finals) while rejecting the well attested and categorically appropriate *-*sk*- (*-*sk̥*-) element, which further correlates with the stem inflexion in Arm. -*i*-.

Hans Jensen's *Altarmenische Grammatik* (1959) 110 §287 is a distinct retreat from the high level reached by Meillet, and in particular, while setting forth the facts duly, he offers the unenlightening and nearly perverse statement *հանաչեմ*. . . "kenne" mit dem zu einer anderen Wurzel gehörigen suppletiven Aor. *ծանեալ*. . . That this is not an inadvertence is confirmed by the recapitulation of our verb in §288 listing suppletiva.

In fact, mixed sequences of sibilant and chuintant affricates seem to be sufficiently rare in Armenian as to make it worth writing an assimilation (or long-component) rule such as clearly obtains for Navajo and for Resian Slovene; on the latter see my note *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 32, 1987: 51. Someone should look into this.

I now realize in retrospect that my observation for Arm. -*w*- as continuing a contextual spirant value for a PIE laryngeal is

supported in fact by Greek evidence. In accounting for the lexeme ἄνθρωπος I have argued ("Anthrōk^wos", *Atti e Memorie del I° Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia* [Rome 1967], Rome 1969: 786-90; *BSLP* 68, 1973: 77-92; *Živa Antika* 31, 1981: 133-4; *Български Език* 37, 1987: 305 f.) that the aspiration of the θ is explained by the phonetic effect of the spirancy of the laryngeal accompanying the Brugmannian "long sonant" in *Anr-A^wk^w-o-, just as the obviously following laryngeal had its effect in ὀφθαλμός < *A^wek^wt(s)-Al-mo- (: Lat. *oculus* < *A^wek^w-Al-o-), and as is well recognized in Skt. *tīṣṭhati* < *(s)ti+stAeti.

INITIALS AND "PROTHETICS"

ERIC P. HAMP
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Birgit Olsen, Greppin, and Kortlandt have contributed in important ways in recent years to the debate and solution of the fate of the PIE laryngeals in Armenian; see, notably, the exchange in *REA* 21, 1988-1989: 477-83. But I feel that they are in part talking past one another without taking full account of all possibilities.

There can be no doubt that *anicanem* shows the vocalized 3rd laryngeal; see *PBH* = *ИФЖ* 1983: 1, 39.

Arm. *y-aṛnem* is really indeterminate, since, apart from the preverb *y-*, **ar* can reflect the vocalization of syllabic *r*.

Arm. *aniw* looks acceptable, but I for one am not persuaded that in PIE an independent Dehnstufe existed.

As I have stated in the Berbérian Memorial, I take *akn* to show the vocalized 3rd laryngeal in a weak-case form of a root noun. Surely, this base had an initial laryngeal, **A^wek^w-*; see in addition to Olsen's remarks (482) my article *BSLP* 68, 1973: 77-92,

and esp. the reduplicated Skt. *īkṣate* < *A^wī-A^wk^wts-e-t-o-i.

Arm. *ateam* also looks like a plausible vocalized *A^w.

However *anun*¹ and *atamn* (NB Greek νῆσις < *n-Ed-ti-) reflect original *E, which on the Greek evidence was coloured, in vocalizing, by the following syllable; see my argument *MSS* 37, 1978: 59ff. Did Armenian share in this coloration?

Gk. ἐρεύγομαι also shows *E-. Therefore *orcam* must be *Eoruġ-.

Since *r- developed its own vocalisms initially it is plausible that we might find here some unexpected results, e.g. copies from the subsequent internal vowel. For 'nail' we expect the output of *A^w- (*A^wnog^wh-), but we must also reckon with dissimilation here.

I agree that *hoviw* and *hum* must reflect *A^we-. Therefore *oskr* may well be *A^wo-, as also *otb*, and perhaps *or*.

Arm. *ozni* seems to be *Eo-, and I have claimed extensively elsewhere that ὄρχις had the fourth laryngeal followed by *o vocalism (except in those dialects showing a reflex of zero-grade).

Arm. *inn* is certainly puzzling in detail, but εἶναι- is easily a perfectly normal zero-grade to *Eneun. However, *inn* and *anun* had different following contexts. I find it hard to believe that the i- of *inn* is not the expected *E vocalized.

1. I do not believe that 'name' has also a medial laryngeal.

ARMENIAN HIWCANIM 'WASTE AWAY'

ERIC P. HAMP
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

I do not understand why *hiwcanim* would reflect **sēwg-* (: Goth. *siuks*)¹. In a pretonic syllable we might expect a reduction as appears in *srt-* to *sirt* 'heart'². In the abstract, apart from an initial **H-*, we might look for an original **k^wei-* or **pei-*. If the *wc* sequence does not involve a syncope, it is possible to see here **ng^w* (cf. *awcanem*). The nasal could then entail a raising of an original **e*. This opens the possibility that we have here **seng^w-n-ē-* > **hing^wanē-* > **hiw^ganē-* > **hiw^ganē-* > *hiwcani-*; at the same time we must eliminate *ankanim* from Pokorny's entry **seng^w-*.

In that case, *hiwcanim* would be the true cognate of Eng. *sink*, ON *søkkva*, etc.

1. *AArmL* 10,1989, 22 §2.5.

2. It is not guaranteed that always and in all instances *iw* is conserved as H. Jensen *Grammatik* (1959) 23 §49 reports.

LONG VOWELS IN ARMENIAN

ERIC P. HAMP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Without desiring to argue Osthoff's Law at this time, I submit the following remarks to B. A. Olsen's stimulating and probing note (*AArmLing* 10,1989,20-22) as a contribution to the continuing discussion: On semantic and phonological grounds I think Olsen's tracing (§2.3) of *hīr* 'retro' to an old endless locative **pērsen* 'heel' an excellent and imaginative suggestion.

Her acute observation (§2.2) of *cuṛ croy* as containing *-ṛ-* is quite in order. But I am reluctant to recognize for PIE a Dehnstufe independent of inflexional phonetics (lengthening with absorption of **-s*). I suggest then, that *cuṛ* had *ṛ* from the verb, and that *ciem* was **ġūr-s-*, with a desiderative derivation or a formation of the type ᾶλέξω. In this way we conserve an exact Helleno-Armenian correspondence.

It is not necessary for *urju* < **ōrtyo+u-* to be derived from a Dehnstufe, although of course my present statement would in no way deny the inapplicability of Osthoff's Law in this case. A preform of the configuration **V-A^wr-ti-* would furnish a perfectly adequate explanation. For instance, an old compound with **ho-* (*h* = the 4th laryngeal) would qualify. We would then have a form comparable to *utem* = Albanian *ha* 'eat(s)', as I have analyzed these in *Studime filologjike* 26, 1, 1972, 81f., and *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft, Kommun.forsch.* (East Berlin) 42, 1989, 102-4.